

COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY MEETING MINUTES

May 7, 2004
9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Arizona Supreme Court

Conference Room 119
1501 W. Washington
Phoenix, AZ 85007

MEMBERS PRESENT

Kent Batty
Tom Brady, *for Louraine Arkfeld*
Michael Baumstark
Max Ivey, *for Christopher Cummiskey*
B. Robert Dorfman
Peter Eckerstrom
Jeanne Hicks
Michael Jeanes
Donna Killoughey
Gary Kremarik
Martin Krizay
Ruth McGregor
Marcus Reinkensmeyer
James Soto
Sheldon Weisberg

GUESTS

Sean Abrigo
John Barrett, TAC
Eric Ciminski
Janet Cornell, CACC, TAC
Dave Davis, CACC, TAC
Margaret Guidero, Yuma Superior Court
Sue Hall, Apache Superior Court
Donald Jacobson, CACC
Kimberlee Johnson, CACC
John King, TAC
Jana Mangum, Apache Superior Court
Cary Meister, TAC
Carol Merfeld, Pima Superior Court
Gordon Mulleneaux, CACC
Patricia Noland, CACC
Gregg Obuch, CACC, TAC
Michael Pollard, CACC
Eloise Price, TAC
Rick Rager, Tempe Municipal Court
Will Tagart, TAC
Brandie Vega

MEMBERS ABSENT

AOC STAFF

Dave Byers
Bobbie Chinsky
William Earl
Gary Graham
Maureen Haggerty
Melinda Hardman
Karl Heckart
Paul Hrisho
Tim Lawler
Stephanie Nolan
Robert Roll
Amy Wood

WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS

Vice Chief Justice Ruth McGregor called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m., welcomed members and members and guests introduced themselves.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the January 9, 2004 Commission on Technology meeting. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-51

COT AND JCEF

Mike Baumstark outlined changes to the Commission on Technology that will be coming; they result from legislative changes or negotiated compromises introduced by bills sponsored by the Arizona Clerks of Court Association. They include adding four new members to the Commission on Technology which the Chief Justice will select from recommendations made by the governor, the legislature, the association of counties and the league of cities and towns. Further, the Arizona Judicial Council (AJC) will determine the level of automation funding to come from JCEF. It was noted that this had the potential of reducing the amount currently projected as available since other interests within AJC may change the automation priorities of the past.

He referred to the policies and procedures currently used to guide grant funding decisions. He asked members to review it and, particularly, to suggest appropriate changes to the local JCEF processes to reflect the agreement between the AOC and Clerks that written local JCEF requests might be eliminated for spending under a specified amount.

This was discussion only and members did not decide on specific changes to the policies and procedures for grant application requirements and reviews.

STRATEGIC INITIATIVES REVIEW

Karl Heckart described and provided status for each of the strategic initiatives adopted in last year's information technology plan.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to continue to hold systemic thinking as a top on-going priority and expect that all state and local projects perform analysis from this perspective. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-52

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to continue to support and maintain statewide core software applications as an on-going priority. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-53

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to continue to support and maintain statewide support for hardware; software and desktop help both on-site and by phone as an on-going priority. Continue the Field Trainer funding support per previous COT funding decisions. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-54

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve continued infrastructure maintenance. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-55

Members discussed the development of a court financial system as the top priority. It was noted that meeting materials were in error as to the status of this initiative since COT did not place this project on hold at the last meeting. However, since the last meeting, the development project halted work and resources from the AOC and from Maricopa Clerk's Office were reassigned. There was discussion as to whether this initiative's priority should be changed to align with the acquisition of new case management systems, since it is dependent on those solutions. Maricopa Clerk's Office noted that new financial system remains a top priority for them as well. The final consensus was that this initiative should remain the top priority but it must be integrated with any new case management systems, developed or acquired. Further understandings were that Maricopa Superior Court will proceed with addressing their financial system needs and that Pima Superior Court will eventually need an integrated CFS and CMS but that the existing Clerk's CFS is operating well now.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded for the initiative for a new court financial system to be placed on hold pending resolution of case management system directions. The motion was amended and seconded for this statewide and Maricopa County Superior Court initiative to develop a new court financial system integrated into case management systems to remain a high priority; however, the statewide initiative must be scheduled with appropriate consideration given to the available resources and to final decisions made regarding acquisition of case management systems for limited and general jurisdiction courts. The amended motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-56

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to continue to support the project to develop standard codes. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-57

It was noted that a consultant with considerable court experience had been retained and the target completion date was January 2005. The first deliverable will be a validation of the structure provided by the Clerks of Superior Court.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to continue support for the Penalty Enforcement Program (PEP) and Fines, Fees and Restitution Enforcement (FARE) initiatives. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-58

It was noted that the City of Phoenix Municipal Court will be the first court with an entirely automated interface to the FARE program. Implementation is planned for late summer. Backlog processing, which has been very successful in the pilot courts, will continue.

With respect to financial rule uniformity and simplification, members noted that procedures and court rules can be addressed more easily and quickly than changes in statute. Thus, courts will focus on process simplification and uniformity and not hold off on development or acquisition of systems while awaiting recommendations and efforts regarding statute changes.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to continue to support the initiative for financial rule uniformity. The motion was amended to continue to support the initiative for financial rule uniformity as possible as a new case financial system is developed. The amended motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-59

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to continue support for the rollout of the Arizona Probation Enterprise Tracking System (APETS), the adult probation automation system. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-60

There was considerable discussion of electronic document management system and the need to assure an interface to any acquired case management system. Ms. Patricia Noland asked that the Pima Clerk's internally developed document management system be considered as a statewide standard. It was noted that ACJA 1-501 defines a process, which includes an audit and analysis, for this. It was noted that the current standard is a product selected in an RFP process.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to continue to support electronic document management systems as part of an overall records management strategy in accordance with the Arizona Code of Judicial Administration sections 1-504, 1-505 and 1-506. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-61

Members discussed the exception process for the Enterprise Architecture Standard, ACJA 1-505. They requested that an ad hoc committee be formed to review the current form being "piloted" (a modified version of the Government Information Technology Agency's Project Investment Justification form) and make recommendations as to a final form for requesting exceptions.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to continue support for Enterprise Architecture Standards. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-62

Karl Heckart outlined current integration projects within the courts, including electronic disposition reporting, the court protective order repository, electronic citation import, adult and juvenile probation queries for law enforcement, and many functions in FARE. He noted that the integration competency center was an approach requiring reorganization of existing resources, not a request for additional funding. Members, especially from Maricopa Superior, Phoenix Municipal and Coconino Superior noted their integration projects.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to continue support for integration projects, including funding for staffing a justice integration competency center to facilitate, monitor, manage and provide technical expertise for integration projects. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-63

Members discussed the current status of workgroup efforts to make recommendations on new case management systems for limited and general jurisdiction courts. Specific recommendations from the Court Automation Coordinating Committee (CACC) remain to be submitted. A CACC meeting on May 24 will address this. They plan on reporting to the COT at its next meeting. The Clerks of Court will be meeting in June and making their recommendations to CACC. Therefore, specific directions or solutions are deferred to the September 10 meeting.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to continue to support finding a solution to address the long-term automated case management needs of general jurisdiction courts. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-64

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to continue to support finding a solution to address the long-term automated case management needs of limited jurisdiction courts. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-65

A letter from the Information Technology Authorizing Committee (ITAC) was provided to members as an additional handout. The letter, resulting from the April 28 ITAC review of the new JOLTS development project, provided approval for the JOLTSaz project to proceed.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to continue to support the JOLTSng development effort that will upgrade the technology, provide functional enhancements and unify existing diverse JOLTS systems (Pima and rural statewide). The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-66

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to continue support for the Public Access strategic initiative. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-67

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to continue to support providing technical training for court technical support personnel. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-68

Members discussed the optimum approach to process standardization which would be to identify best practices and processes before acquiring or developing a statewide case management system. However, the time required for this effort would be considerable – at least two years – and may delay the acquisition for too long. A compromise position was preferred, where some processes will be defined by the system acquired and then some modules will be modified if they don't support necessary processes.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to continue support for process standardization, particularly as it relates to implementation of new case management systems that may be procured. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-69

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to continue to support a web presence for the Arizona Judicial Branch and all its courts. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-70

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to continue to maintain staff to participate in requested development of enhancements to APETS. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-71

Members discussed current efilg projects in Arizona courts. Mr. Michael Jeanes, Clerk of Superior Court in Maricopa County, noted that there have been some process challenges in his pilot implementation of electronic filing. Standardization and the ability of the clerk and/or system to reject documents not filed according to court rules were two issues of concern.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to pursue efilg capability. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-72

Another committee, Keeping the Record, is exploring rules and policies for maintaining court records in the new electronic environment. Once it has provided its final report, TAC will be asked to make technical standards recommendations on formats, standards or automation procedures to support the business needs they identify.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to continue to support the audio and video court records initiative and for the Technical Advisory Council to be referred any technology-related questions for recommendation. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-73

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to continue to support the electronic signatures initiative and direct that the goal is for the court to adopt a standard statewide for electronic signatures on electronic documents issued by the court. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-74

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to continue to support the interactive jury processing initiative. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-75

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to continue to support video conferencing technologies in court proceedings. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-76

JCEF FUNDING: STATUS AND PROJECTIONS

Karl Heckart provided a status of the Judicial Collections Enhancement Fund. He noted that there has been a small growth trend (1.6%) instead of the flat projections of several months ago. He suggested some measures to improve the funds long-term viability. This included changing the replacement cycle of PCs to four years instead of three and recalculating the balance with previously reserved funds released since selected projects have been delayed or cancelled.

Members decided not to act on specific suggestions at this time. They wished to get more information on other funding influences and decisions, including CACC's recommendations on case management systems.

FUNDING REQUEST: PIMA SUPERIOR COURT

Mr. Kent Batty, Court Administrator of the Superior Court in Pima County, and Patty Noland, Clerk of Superior Court in Pima County, presented their joint request for State JCEF funding. There was considerable discussion and many questions about the Pima Superior Court approach. Primarily, there was concern that the court administration and clerk's office were building duplicative and un-integrated systems. Ms. Noland assured the COT that Pima County Superior Court would develop a LVC system that integrates with the new statewide system. She clarified that the clerk's office plan is not to add new modules, but to port existing modules into the .NET environment.

On the question of a duplicative infrastructure for Crystal Reporting, Ms. Noland stated that she and court administration had resolved this issue. They will share the reporting server and licenses and thus the clerk's office reduced their request for Crystal licenses from \$119,000 to \$57,600.

Ms. Noland pointed out that her current system, developed in-house, has case initiation and docketing; she indicated that perhaps her system, rather than iCIS, should be considered for those functions. She said she'd look at iCIS but wasn't sure it would be the best for her county. She doesn't want to "just throw away her [existing] system" without a complete analysis of its functionality against iCIS. She expects that "analysis is part of what will happen over the next few months," and assured the COT that her staff are "meeting and communicating with court administration everyday" on automation development coordination. She agreed that a single server and joint development would be fine if analysis proved it to be the best thing. She expressed strongly her desire to be included in planning with the AOC on the iCIS

development work and assured members that her intent was to have a system that was fully integrated; she would work with court administration and the AOC to achieve that. She agreed that phase 1 of this project was “figuring out what we need.”

Members agreed that the first phase should look at the clerk’s system and see if or how it fit in with the overall project goal of porting iCIS to .NET and yielding an integrated case management system. The plan must also add another task to include the clerk’s system in the analysis.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve in concept the porting iCIS to .NET and to encumber \$464,000 and approve \$34,000 now to perform Phase 1. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-77

COUNTY INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC PLANS

Vice Chief Justice McGregor set the stage for the information technology strategic plan (ITSP) review. She noted that if a project’s plan was fully described, including budget, in the ITSP then there was the expectation that no additional approvals were required for the court to proceed. Otherwise, approval was general and strategic, and specific projects would still require the expected documentation. Further, approval did not override any other reporting requirements that might be specified elsewhere. Karl Heckart presented the overall trends and each plan.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the Arizona Supreme Court Information Technology Strategic Plan for FY 2005-2007. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-78

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the Court of Appeals; Division I and Division II Strategic Plan for FY 2005-2007. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-79

Two projects in the Apache Courts’ plan were specifically an issue. First, the plan to use of an alternate cash management system (Pima Clerk’s CrimWeb) in place of/addition to AZTEC was thought to be against ACJA 1-501. The request to implement the “grandfathered-in” EDMS system currently in use in Pima Superior Court Clerk’s office contradicted the provisions of ACJA 1-505. These two projects were identified as exceptions to approval. Ms. Noland indicated a desire to have both her internally developed systems become an approved standard. The administrative codes provide for a process.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve, with the exceptions noted (alternate cash management and electronic document management systems), Apache County Courts Strategic Plan for FY 2005-2007. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-80

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Coconino County Courts Strategic Plan for FY 2005-2007. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-81

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Gila County Courts Strategic Plan for FY 2005-2007. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-82

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Greenlee County Courts Strategic Plan for FY 2005-2007. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-83

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Graham County Courts Strategic Plan for FY 2005-2007. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-84

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve La Paz County Courts Strategic Plan for FY 2005-2007. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-85

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Maricopa County Courts, the Maricopa Court Administration and Maricopa Clerk of Court Strategic Plan for FY 2005-2007. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-86

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Mohave County Courts Strategic Plan for FY 2005-2007. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-87

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Navajo County Courts Strategic Plan for FY 2005-2007. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-88

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Santa Cruz County Courts Strategic Plan for FY 2005-2007. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-89

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Yavapai County Courts Strategic Plan for FY 2005-2007. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-90

MARICOPA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT: EXPANSION OF EFILING PILOT

Will Tagart presented the status and proposed direction for electronic filing in the Superior Court in Maricopa County. They are exploring options for expanding the scope beyond complex litigation cases and broadening participation from their current single vendor to multiple vendors. They will likely be issuing an RFP in the next several months. He noted that no final decision had been made as to approach.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve Maricopa Superior Court moving forward with expanding its electronic filing pilot. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-91

Members returned to the issue of JCEF spending and related cost-saving measures.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve a 4-year replacement cycle for PCs. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-92

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to reflect the projected large volume court (LVC) delays in case management system implementation in the reserved JCEF projections for PC leasing, thus pushing out the expenditures approximately four years. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-03-93

It was determined that the June 4 meeting would be held to consider the other funding and projection issues, specifically the court financial system (CFS) funding reserve and the LVC funding reserve. A report from the Court Automation Coordinating Committee is expected to provide information to assist members in making this determination.

Vice Chief Justice McGregor also noted that there were possibly other issues, such as the request of Apache Superior Court for an exception to Enterprise Architecture Standards, which may require a summer phone conference.

CALL TO THE PUBLIC

The meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.